

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Upon entry of this amendment, claims 1-9 are pending and present for examination. Claims 1 and 5 have been amended. Amended claims are supported by the specification. No new matter has been added. Reconsideration is respectfully requested.

Claim Rejections – 35 USC § 102

Claims 1-4 and 8-9 were rejected under 35 USC § 102(e) as allegedly being anticipated by Friskney et al., U.S. Publication No. 2004/0120705 (hereinafter Friskney). Applicants respectfully traverse.

Claim 1 recites the following:

1. A method for implementing distribution of link state information in an optical network, comprising the steps of:
 - determining information of each link protection attribute section included in a Traffic Engineering (TE) link;
 - carrying the information of each link protection attribute section included in the TE link in a customized Type Length Value (TLV), respectively, the customized TLV comprising a field for a number of link protection attribute section structures;
 - distributing the TLV in the optical network via Traffic Engineering Link State Advertisement (TE LSA).

As an example, the method of claim 1 is illustrated in Figure 1 and explained in paragraphs [0034] to [0040] of the specification. As shown in Figure 1 and recited in the claim 1, TE links includes several parts, among which is a TLV value that includes a field for a number of link protection attribute section structures.

Friskney, as cited in the Office Action mailed February 26, 2009, fails to teach or suggest at least “carrying the information of each link protection attribute section included in the TE link in a customized Type Length Value (TLV), respectively, the customized TLV comprising a field for a number of link protection attribute section structures” recited in claim 1. More specifically, Friskney discloses that TLV value is used to define the type of link protection. In contrast, the TLV recited in claim 1 comprises a field for a number of link protection.

Therefore, at least for the above reasons, claim 1 should be allowed. The remaining claims should be allowed for the same reasons as claim 1 and for the specific features they recite.

Allowable Subject Matter

Applicants would like to thank the Examiner for indicating the allowability of claims 5-7. Applicants respectfully submit that claims 5-7 should be allowed, as claim 5 as amended in independent form to include all of the limitations of the base and intervening claims. More specifically, claim 5 is now an independent claim containing claims from claims 1 and 4. Claims 6 and 7 should be allowed since they depend on claim 5, which as amended should be allowable.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing, Applicants believe all claims now pending in this Application are in condition for allowance. The issuance of a formal Notice of Allowance at an early date is respectfully requested.

If the Examiner believes a telephone conference would expedite prosecution of this application, please telephone the undersigned at 650-326-2400.

Respectfully submitted,
/Lu Yin, Reg. No. 60,214/

Lu Yin
Reg. No. 60,214

TOWNSEND and TOWNSEND and CREW LLP
Two Embarcadero Center, Eighth Floor
San Francisco, California 94111-3834
Tel: 650-326-2400
Fax: 415-576-0300
Attachments
L1Y/mcg
61839364 v1